

Arnold E. Brown (SBN 167679)  
Email: abrown@schwabe.com  
Stephen G. Sullivan (SBN 164495)  
Email: ssullivan@schwabe.com  
**SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.**  
455 N. Whisman Rd., Ste. 200  
Mountain View, CA 94043  
Telephone: 650.396.1401  
Facsimile: 650.396.1415

Brenna K. Legaard (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
Email: blegaard@schwabe.com  
**SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.**  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue, Ste. 1900  
Portland, OR 97204  
Telephone: 503.222.9981  
Facsimile: 503.796.2900

*Of Attorneys for Defendant  
Anti-Malware Testing Standards Organization, Inc.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

NSS LABS, INC.,

**Plaintiff,**

V.

CROWDSTRIKE, INC.; SYMANTEC CORPORATION; ESET, LLC; ANTI-MALWARE TESTING STANDARDS ORGANIZATION, INC; AND DOES 1-50, INCLUSIVE.

## Defendants

CASE NO. 5:18-cv-05711-BLF

**DEFENDANT ANTI-MALWARE  
TESTING STANDARDS  
ORGANIZATION, INC.'S RESPONSE TO  
THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT'S  
STATEMENT OF INTEREST**

1           **The primary reason AMTSO should be dismissed has nothing to do with the**  
 2 **SDOAA.** NSS fails to allege that AMTSO participated in the purported boycott. All AMTSO is  
 3 alleged to have done is to adopt a voluntary standard and foster debate about its merits, which is  
 4 not illegal at all, let alone *per se* illegal. *See FTC v. Superior Court Trial Lawyers Ass'n*, 493  
 5 U.S. 411, 425-26 (1990) ("[I]t is, of course, clear that the association's efforts to publicize the  
 6 boycott, to explain the merits of its cause... were activities that were fully protected by the First  
 7 Amendment" even where the boycott itself violated antitrust laws.); Dkt. 86 at 23 ("If the  
 8 antitrust laws are going to chill debate, which they don't, we would really be in the wrong  
 9 place."). This basis for dismissal is entirely independent from the SDOAA.

10           **The Division's argument contradicts Supreme Court and Ninth Circuit precedent**  
 11 **regarding when a statutory provision should be construed as an affirmative defense.** The  
 12 Division urges the Court to find that the SDOAA establishes an affirmative defense in order to  
 13 shift the burden of proof to AMTSO. But the Supreme Court and the Ninth Circuit have defined  
 14 the circumstances in which such a burden shift is appropriate, and the Division neither  
 15 acknowledges nor follows that precedent.

16           NSS bears the burden of proof unless Congress intend to shift it to AMTSO. "It is one of  
 17 the most basic propositions of the law . . . that the plaintiff bears the burden of proving his case."  
 18 *Tourgeman v. Nelson & Kennar*, 900 F.3d 1105, 1109 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2018) (internal quotations and  
 19 cite omitted). "[C]ertain elements of a plaintiff's claim may be shifted to defendants, when such  
 20 elements can fairly be characterized as affirmative defenses or exemptions." *Schaffer v. Weast*,  
 21 546 U.S. 49, 57-58 (2005) *Id.* (cite omitted). But "[a]bsent some reason to believe that Congress  
 22 intended otherwise," the Court should "conclude that the burden of persuasion lies where it  
 23 usually falls, upon the party seeking relief," which is NSS. *Id.* (cite omitted).

24           Nothing in the SDOAA suggests that Congress intended to shift the burden of proof. *See*  
 25 15 U.S.C. §4302; *Tourgeman*, 900 F.3d at 1110 ("If Congress had intended to depart from the  
 26 default rule and make net worth an affirmative defense or exemption, it could have limited  
 27 liability to \$500,000 *unless* the [pertinent language applied].") (citing *Evankavitch v. Green Tree*  
 28 *Servicing, LLC*, 793 F.3d 355, 362 (3d Cir. 2015) (holding that "unless" is "telltale language...")

1 indicative of an affirmative defense.”)). Nothing in the legislative history addresses the burden  
 2 of proof at all, let alone supports the Division’s position. The Division’s argument must be  
 3 rejected because the Division fails to follow controlling case law or support its position with any  
 4 evidence that Congress intended the SDOAA to be an affirmative defense.

5 **The Division asks the Court to eviscerate the SDOAA.** As the Division itself  
 6 contends, a “balance of interest” requires “meaningful involvement.” Dkt. 91 at 4-5. The  
 7 Division cannot and does not contend that testers were not meaningfully involved in developing  
 8 the Standard. In addition to the tester participation detailed at Dkt. 66, pp 6-8, which the  
 9 Division ignores, the Court should note that contrary to NSS’s representation to the Court, Dkt.  
 10 86 at p. 41, an NSS representative was on the AMTSO Board from December of 2016 through  
 11 June of 2017. Instead of crediting the involvement of testers including NSS in the development  
 12 of the Standard, the Division advocates a numerical test that is not found in the statute or the  
 13 OMB Circular, and that would eviscerate the SDOAA. No SDO can be defined by “openness,”  
 14 as the OMB Circular requires, and also ensure that no “interest” is numerically outnumbered by  
 15 any other “interest,” because the Division would impose a need to limit membership in order to  
 16 achieve “balance.” Moreover, any plaintiff could define “interest” in any way that suits his  
 17 case—the Division uncritically adopts NSS’s definition of “testers” as an outnumbered “interest”  
 18 even though half of testers voted for the Standard. *See* Dkt. 51 at 12. The losing side of any vote  
 19 is by definition an “interest” that was outnumbered.

20 Congress’s purpose in adopting the SDOAA was to encourage activity by SDOs by  
 21 providing “relief from the threat of liability under the antitrust laws.” Dkt. 51 at p. 16 (quoting  
 22 149 Cong Rec H 5104 (June 10, 2003)). The Division asks this Court to construe the SDOAA in  
 23 such a way that it provides no such relief, which is demonstrably at odds with Congressional  
 24 intent.

1 Dated this 8<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,

2 SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

3

4

5 By: /s/ Brenna K. Legaard

6 Brenna K. Legaard (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
7 Email: blegaard@schwabe.com  
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue, Ste. 1900  
Portland, OR 97204  
Telephone: 503.222.9981

8

9 Arnold E. Brown (SBN 167679)  
10 Email: abrown@schwabe.com  
Stephen G. Sullivan (SBN 164495)  
11 Email: ssullivan@schwabe.com  
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.  
12 455 N. Whisman Rd., Ste. 200  
Mountain View, CA 94043  
13 Telephone: 650.396.1401

14 *Of Attorneys for Defendant*  
15 *Anti-Malware Testing Standards Organization, Inc.*